Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEBA_69774**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The Impact of ICT on Terrorism in African Countries**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	The overall paper is good, and good effort has been made by the author in this paper, however there are some suggestions to improve the paper: Author needs to justify why the period between 1998-2012 is studied and why not including the recent years where the use of information and communication technology has been increased. The following references need to be checked and the full details should be provided: [1],[5] [13], and [38]. The article "Remittances, Financial Inclusion and Income Inequality in Africa" should be cited and added to the references.	The study period is justify by the availability of the data of the main variables of our models. I did it, see the text
Minor REVISION comments	The format of the tables should be checked and organized well. Some of tables can be moved to the appendix to keep the organization of the article clear. For section 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND EMPIRICAL LITERATURE, the author can add a table to summarize the current studies and identify the research gap clearly.	All our tables are the consequences of the different development made in the text. If we send some tables in appendices, it can destruct the organisation of the article. We already mentioned in introduction all our contributions.
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	No